



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,751	08/13/2002	Go Kondo	JP920000461US1	8459
48233 7590 08/17/2007 SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C. 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA SUITE 300 GARDEN CITY, NY 11530			EXAMINER DAO, THUY CHAN	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/17/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

50

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/064,751		KONDO, GO	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Thuy Dao		2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on June 8, 2007 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-15 have been examined.

Response to Amendments

3. Per Applicant's request, claims 1, 6-7, and 11-12 have been amended. Claim 15 has been added.

4. The objection to the claim 12 is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments.

Response to Arguments

5. The Applicant is thanked for a thorough reply. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Double Patenting

6. For the record, claims 1, 6, and 12 of the instant application have been rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9 (dependent on claim 1), 3 (dependent on claims 2 and 1), and 21 (dependent on claim 13) of US Patent No. 6,745,208. In Remarks filed April 3, 2006, page 9, lines 5-7, Applicant elected to postpone filing a terminal disclaimer until such time an indication of allowable subject matter has been received.

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory

Art Unit: 2192

obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

8. Claims 1, 6, and 12 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9, 3, and 21, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,208 (hereinafter "'208"). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are all directed to a method and apparatus for synchronizing a source model with a target model by model converter (instant application) or an object mapping mechanism ('208) and automatically transferring updates using an event generator (instant application) or an adapter software module ('208).

Instant Application	US Patent No. 6,745,208
<p>Claim 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>an application editing apparatus (lines 1-2);</i> • <i>an editing module for editing a first model in said application (line 3);</i> • <i>a model converter for converting the first model edited by said editing module into a second model (lines 4-5);</i> • <i>a view display module ... to display said second model on a display device (lines 6-7);</i> • <i>said view display moudle comprises an event generator for generating an event based on an update ... (lines 8-9);</i> • <i>updates changed portion of the view displayed on said display device based on the event generated by said event generator (lines 10-11).</i> 	<p>Claim 9 (dependent on claim 1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>an XML editor software application in a computer apparatus (claim 9);</i> • <i>an editor software application to transfer changes made to DOM nodes (claim 1, lines 6-7);</i> • <i>a map of information objects for nodes of said DOM (claim 1, lines 4-5); using said map information objects to create an adapter software module adapted to transfer changes (lines 10-12);</i> • <i>wherein changes made in one are reflected to the other without re-parsing ... (claim 1, lines 20-21);</i> • <i>responsive to creation of , or other change in, a DOM node or an object model object, running said corresponding adapter software module to transfer the change ... (claim 1, lines 16-19);</i> • <i>transfer the change to said corresponding other of siad DOM node or object model object, whereby changes made in one are reflected to the other without re-</i>

	parsing an XML document (claim 1, lines 18-22).
<p>Claim 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>an editing module for editing a first model in said application (line 3);</i>• <i>a model converter for converting the first model edited by said editing module into a second model (lines 4-5);</i>• <i>a view display module for using a view of said second model to display said second model on a display device (lines 6-7);</i>• <i>an event converter for converting an event causing an update made to said first model to be reflected in a view of said first model ... (lines 8-10);</i>• <i>wherein said view display module updates changed portion of the view displayed on said display</i>	<p>Claim 3 (with claim chain 1→2→3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• an editor software application to transfer changes made to DOM nodes (claim 1, lines 6-7);• a map of information objects for nodes of said DOM (claim 1, lines 4-5); using said map information objects to create an adapter software module adapted to transfer changes (lines 10-12);• transfer the change to said corresponding other of said DOM node or object model object, whereby <u>changes made in one are reflected to the other</u> without re-parsing an XML document (claim 1, lines 18-22, emphasis added).• responsive to creation of , or other change in, a DOM node or an object model object, running said corresponding adapter software module to transfer the change ... (claim 1, lines 16-19);• using said map information objects to create an adapter software module adapted to transfer changes

<i>device based on the event generated by said event converter</i> (lines 11-12).	(lines 10-12); transfer the change to said corresponding other of said DOM node or object model object, whereby changes made in one are reflected to the other without re-parsing an XML document (claim 1, lines 18-22, emphasis added).
Claim 12 (a program version of claim 1).	Claim 21 (dependent on claim 13, wherein claim 13 is a computer readable product version of claim 1).

The currently amended claims are still infact on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting with respect to said US Patent No. 6,745,208. Thus, the outstanding rejection remains and repeats hereto for completeness.

Claim Objections

9. Newly added claim 15 is objected to because of minor informalities. The Applicant pointed out that support for the amendment could be found on page 17 (fifth paragraph) and page 18 (Remarks, page 8, lines 4-5). However, these paragraphs do not fully support the specific limitations "...updates only changed portion of the view displayed on said display device ..." (claim 15, lines 10-11, emphasis added).

For a proper prosecution record, the examiner respectfully requests the Applicant point out the supporting text portion of said particular limitations in the next communication with the Office.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2192

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of US Patent No. 6,934,740 to Lawande et al. (art made of record, hereinafter "Lawande").

Claim 1:

APA discloses an apparatus/program (FIG. 39 and [004-034]) and *an application editing apparatus for using a computer to edit an application having a model and a view separated from each other (e.g., FIG. 39), comprising:*

an editing module for editing a first model in said application (e.g., page 4, [026], "... Examples of such an editor including a model converter function are XML writer available from Wattle Software and Excelon Stylus available from eXcelon. These editors display a source model in a source code view (source view) for editing...", emphasis added);

a model converter for converting the first model edited by said editing module into a second model (also page 4, [026], "Furthermore, a model converter is not only used by itself but also included in an editor for generating a preview model", emphasis added); and

a view display module for using a view of said second model to display said second model on a display device (page 4, [026], "In response to this operation, a model converter included in the editor converts the entire source model into a new model to update the preview, which is a view of the converted model"; FIG. 39, page 3, [0021]);

*wherein said view display module comprises an **explicit request** based on an update in said second model if said second model is updated based on an edit of said first model made by said editing module and updates changed portion of the view displayed on said display device based on **said explicit request** (e.g., page 5, [0031],*

"... Instead, a user should explicitly request an update of the target to convert the entire source model into the target model-view pair"; FIG. 39, changing target model-view pair A-A2 based on an edit of source model B; changing target model-view pair B-B2 based on an edit of source model A or C; changing target model-view pair C-C based on an edit of source model B, emphasis added).

Furthermore, APA discloses:

dynamically changing views displayed on the display devices based on an edit of the source model (e.g., FIG. 37, Add a node in source model → Notify event to other views → Insert event to other views → update other views, pages 1-2, [0005-0008]; page 2, [0014]; FIG. 39, model-view pairs A-A2, B-B2, and C-C);

an explicit request for synchronizing updates between two models (e.g., page 5, [0031]; FIG. 39, synchronizing updates between models A, B, and C).

APA does not explicitly disclose *an event generator for generating an event based on an update in said second model if said second model is updated based on an edit of said first model made by said editing module* (emphasis added).

However, in an analogous art of data integration through a dynamic common model, Lawande discloses *an event generator for generating an event based on an update in said second model if said second model is updated based on an edit of said first model made by said editing module* (e.g., marking new, modified, or deleted events for data synchronization, FIG. 23, blocks 1108-1116, col.48: 56 – col.50: 54; col.28: 31-53; col.25: 34-56; FIG. 20 and 24, col.49: 62 – col.50: 17).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Lawande into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so to display, update, synchronize data objects among different user interfaces within multiple devices as suggested by Lawande (e.g., col.1: 33-60; FIG. 14, PC 810 and PID 850, col. 44: 48-63; FIG. 21, client device 320 and PID 850, col.47: 64 – col.48: 32; col. 6: 14-26).

Claim 2:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Lawande further discloses *said view display module further comprises: a difference extractor for extracting a difference between said second models before and after an update if said second model is updated based on an edit of said first model made by said editing module and said event generator generates said event by using information about said difference extracted by said difference extractor as a parameter* (e.g., col.28: 31-53; col.25: 34-56; FIG. 23, blocks 1108-1116, col.48: 56 – col.50: 54).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Lawande into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 1 above.

Claim 3:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. APA also discloses *said model converter converts an individual element of said first model into a corresponding element of said second model* (e.g., FIG. 39, Models B - C, and related text page 3, [021]).

Claim 4:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. APA also discloses *if said second model contains no element corresponding to a converted element of said first model, said model converter adds an element corresponding to said converted element to said second model* (e.g., FIG. 39, Models A – B, and related text page 3, [021]).

Claim 5:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. APA also discloses *said model converter converts an element edited by said editing module in said first model into a corresponding element in second model and updates said second model with said converted element* (e.g., pages 3-4, [023-025]).

Claim 6:

Claim 6 is an apparatus version, which recites the same limitations as those of the claims 2-5, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claims, they also teach all of the limitations of claim 6.

Claim 7:

As set forth in claim 1, APA discloses *a data processing method of using a computer to display a model in a given application in a view in another application (e.g., FIG. 39, displaying model A in a given application A in views B and C in other applications B and C), comprising the steps of:*

updating a second model so that the update is reflected in said second model if a first model in said given application is updated (e.g., FIG. 39, page 3, [0021]); and

generating an explicit operation based on the update made to said second model and, based on said operation, changing the view displayed on a display device in said another application (e.g., page 5, [0031]).

APA does not explicitly disclose:

reading a second model in said another application from a data storage storing said given application;

generating an event based on the update made to said second model.

However, in an analogous art of Lawande discloses:

reading a second model in said another application from a data storage storing said given application (e.g., FIG. 14, synchronization between PC 810 and PID 850, col.44: 48-63; FIG. 7, synchronization between client device 320 and other devices, col.9: 66 – col.10: 47);

generating an event based on the update made to said second model (e.g., FIG. 21, synchronization between client device 320 and PID 850, col.47: 64 – col.48: 32).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Lawande into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so to as set forth above.

Claim 8:

The rejection of base claim 7 is incorporated. Claim 8 is a method version, which recites the same limitations as those of claim 2, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of claim 2, they also teach all of the limitations of claim 8.

Claim 9:

The rejection of intervening claim 8 is incorporated. APA also discloses said step of updating said second model comprises the step of converting elements of said first model into a corresponding elements of said second model, and said step of changing the view in said another application comprises the step of updating the converted elements of said second models (e.g., FIG. 39 and related text in pages 3-6, [020-034]).

APA does not explicitly discloses *the step of converting an individual element of said first model into a corresponding element of said second model, and the step of extracting a difference in the individual converted element of said second models before and after the update.*

However, Lawande further discloses the step of converting an individual element of said first model into a corresponding element of said second model, and the step of extracting a difference in the individual converted element of said second models before and after the update (e.g., col.28: 31-53; col.25: 34-56; FIG. 23, blocks 1108-1116, col.48: 56 – col.50: 54).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Lawande into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 7 above.

Claim 10:

The rejection of base claim 7 is incorporated. APA also discloses

an event causing the update made to said first model to be reflected in a view in said given application (e.g., FIG. 36 and page 2, [006], "If a change is made to the model through a certain view in the application, the change is reflected in the other views")

step of converting said event into an event changing the view in said another application by using a conversion rule for converting said first model into said second model by an explicit operation (e.g., FIG. 39 and pages 3-6, [020-034]).

As set forth in claim 1 above, Lawande discloses *generating an event based on the update made to said second model and, based on said event, changing the view displayed on a display device in said another application (e.g., e.g., marking new, modified, or deleted events for data synchronization, FIG. 23, blocks 1108-1116, col.48: 56 – col.50: 54; col.28: 31-53; col.25: 34-56; FIG. 20 and 24, col.49: 62 – col.50: 17).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Lawande into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

Claim 11:

Claim 11 is a program version, which recites the same limitations as those of claim 9, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claim, they also teach all of the limitations of claim 11.

Claims 12-14:

Claims 12-14 are also program versions, which recite the same limitations as those of claims 2-5 and 9-10, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claims, they also teach all of the limitations of claims 12-14.

Claim 15 (new):

Claim 15 recites the same limitations as those of claim 1, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claim, they also teach all of the limitations of claim 1.

Lawande further discloses updates only changed portion of the view displayed on said display device based on the event generated by said event generator (e.g., col.28: 31-53; col.25: 34-56; FIG. 23, blocks 1108-1116, col.48: 56 – col.50: 54).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Lawande into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 1 above.

12. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of US Patent No. 6,389,423 to Sakakura (art made of record, hereinafter "Sakakura").

Claim 1:

APA discloses an apparatus/program (FIG. 39 and [004-034]) and *an application editing apparatus for using a computer to edit an application having a model and a view separated from each other* (e.g., FIG. 39), comprising:

an editing module for editing a first model in said application (e.g., page 4, [026], "... Examples of such an editor including a model converter function are XML writer available from Wattle Software and Excelon Stylus available from eXcelon. These editors display a source model in a source code view (source view) for editing...", emphasis added);

a model converter for converting the first model edited by said editing module into a second model (also page 4, [026], "Furthermore, a model converter is not only used by itself but also included in an editor for generating a preview model", emphasis added); and

a view display module for using a view of said second model to display said second model on a display device (page 4, [026], "In response to this operation, a model converter included in the editor converts the entire source model into a new

model to update the preview, which is a view of the converted model"; FIG. 39, page 3, [0021]);

*wherein said view display module comprises an **explicit request** based on an update in said second model if said second model is updated based on an edit of said first model made by said editing module and changes the view displayed on said display device based on **said explicit request** (e.g., page 5, [0031], "... Instead, a user should explicitly request an update of the target to convert the entire source model into the target model-view pair"; FIG. 39, changing target model-view pair A-A2 based on an edit of source model B; changing target model-view pair B-B2 based on an edit of source model A or C; changing target model-view pair C-C based on an edit of source model B, emphasis added).*

Furthermore, APA discloses:

dynamically changing views displayed on the display devices based on an edit of the source model (e.g., FIG. 37, Add a node in source model → Notify event to other views → Insert event to other views → update other views, pages 1-2, [0005-0008]; page 2, [0014]; FIG. 39, model-view pairs A-A2, B-B2, and C-C);

an explicit request for synchronizing updates between two models (e.g., page 5, [0031]; FIG. 39, synchronizing updates between models A, B, and C).

APA does not explicitly disclose an event generator for generating an event based on an update in said second model if said second model is updated based on an edit of said first model made by said editing module (i.e., an event generator for synchronizing updates between two models without said explicitly request, emphasis added).

However, in an analogous art of synchronizing data and maintaining data consistency, Sakakura discloses an event generator for generating an event based on an update in said second model if said second model is updated based on an edit of said first model made by said editing module (e.g., FIG. 4, col.8: 13-48; FIG. 8, col.11: 52 – col.12: 50; FIG. 12, col.15: 7-49).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sakakura into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so to share data, maintain copies of a shared data, and maintain consistency of the shared data among a plurality of computer devices as suggested by Sakakura (e.g., col.1: 6-63).

Claim 2:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Sakakura further discloses *said view display module further comprises:*

a difference extractor for extracting a difference between said second models before and after an update if said second model is updated based on an edit of said first model made by said editing module (e.g., col.2: 14-17; FIG. 5, col.9: 28 – col.10: 20; FIG. 21, col.15: 27-45) and

said event generator generates said event by using information about said difference extracted by said difference extractor as a parameter (e.g., FIG. 18, col.8: 49 – col.9: 27; col.15: 27-45).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sakakura into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 1 above.

Claim 3:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. APA also discloses *said model converter converts an individual element of said first model into a corresponding element of said second model (e.g., FIG. 39, Models B - C, and related text page 3, [021]).*

Claim 4:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. APA also discloses *if said second model contains no element corresponding to a converted element of said first model,*

said model converter adds an element corresponding to said converted element to said second model (e.g., FIG. 39, Models A – B, and related text page 3, [021]).

Claim 5:

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. APA also discloses *said model converter converts an element edited by said editing module in said first model into a corresponding element in second model and updates said second model with said converted element (e.g., pages 3-4, [023-025]).*

Claim 6:

Claim 6 is an apparatus version, which recites the same limitations as those of the claims 2-5, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claims, they also teach all of the limitations of claim 6.

Claim 7:

As set forth in claim 1, APA discloses *a data processing method of using a computer to display a model in a given application in a view in another application (e.g., FIG. 39, displaying model A in a given application A in views B and C in other applications B and C), comprising the steps of:*

updating a second model so that the update is reflected in said second model if a first model in said given application is updated (e.g., FIG. 39, page 3, [0021]); and

generating an explicit operation based on the update made to said second model and, based on said operation, changing the view displayed on a display device in said another application (e.g., page 5, [0031]).

APA does not explicitly disclose *reading a second model in said another application from a data storage storing said given application; generating an event based on the update made to said second model.*

However, in an analogous art of synchronizing data and maintaining data consistency, Sakakura discloses *reading a second model in said another application from a data storage storing said given application; generating an event based on the update made to said second model* (e.g., FIG. 4, col.8: 13-48; FIG. 8: col.11: 52 – col.12: 50).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sakakura into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so to as set forth above.

Claim 8:

The rejection of base claim 7 is incorporated. Claim 8 is a method version, which recites the same limitations as those of claim 2, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of claim 2, they also teach all of the limitations of claim 8.

Claim 9:

The rejection of intervening claim 8 is incorporated. APA also discloses said step of updating said second model comprises the step of converting elements of said first model into a corresponding elements of said second model, and said step of changing the view in said another application comprises the step of updating the converted elements of said second models (e.g., FIG. 39 and related text in pages 3-6, [020-034]).

APA does not explicitly discloses *the step of converting an individual element of said first model into a corresponding element of said second model, and the step of extracting a difference in the individual converted element of said second models before and after the update.*

However, Sakakura further discloses *the step of converting an individual element of said first model into a corresponding element of said second model, and the step of extracting a difference in the individual converted element of said second models before and after the update* (e.g., FIG. 12, col.15: 7-49; col.2: 14-17).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sakakura into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 7 above.

Claim 10:

The rejection of base claim 7 is incorporated. APA also discloses

an event causing the update made to said first model to be reflected in a view in said given application (e.g., FIG. 36 and page 2, [006], "If a change is made to the model through a certain view in the application, the change is reflected in the other views")

step of converting said event into an event changing the view in said another application by using a conversion rule for converting said first model into said second model by an explicit operation (e.g., FIG. 39 and pages 3-6, [020-034]).

As set forth in claim 1 above, Sakakura discloses *generating an event based on the update made to said second model and, based on said event, changing the view displayed on a display device in said another application (e.g., e.g., FIG. 4, col.8: 13-48; FIG. 8, col.11: 52 – col.12: 50; FIG. 12, col.15: 7-49).*

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sakakura into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth above.

Claim 11:

Claim 11 is a program version, which recites the same limitations as those of claim 9, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claim, they also teach all of the limitations of claim 11.

Claims 12-14:

Claims 12-14 are also program versions, which recite the same limitations as those of claims 2-5 and 9-10, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed

Art Unit: 2192

and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claims, they also teach all of the limitations of claims 12-14.

Claim 15 (new):

Claim 15 recites the same limitations as those of claim 1, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claim, they also teach all of the limitations of claim 1.

Sakakura further discloses updates only changed portion of the view displayed on said display device based on the event generated by said event generator (e.g., FIG. 5: col.9: 28 – col.10: 20; FIG. 18, col.8: 49 – col.9: 27; FIG. 21, col.15: 27-45).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sakakura into that of APA. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 1 above.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone is (571) 272 8570. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2192

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Dao

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tuan Dam', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the left.

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER